

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed July 17, 2003. Claims 1, 14, 15, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34-39, 41, 43-49, 51, 53, and 54 have been amended. Claims 1-54 are pending.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejections

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-8, 10, 12-22, 24, 26-33, 36-38, 40-43, 46-48, and 50-54 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hwang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,577,205) (hereinafter "Hwang"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Hwang does not disclose, teach, or suggest a "computer card comprises: a frame; a printed circuit board mounted to the frame; a CPU comprised on the printed circuit board; a memory comprised on the printed circuit board;" and a "human interface logic comprised on the printed circuit board which is operable to receive one or more human interface signals" recited in claim 1. The Examiner cites Hwang at column 6, lines 1-25, 60-65 and column 7, lines 1-10 for this teaching. However, Hwang teaches "the connection to the monitor, by means of a VGA monitor cable, emanates from a VGA card in the computer electronics for each computer system (emphasis added) (Hwang, col. 6, lines 22-24)." Hwang does not teach human interface logic comprised on a printed circuit board that also has a CPU and memory as recited in claim 1. Independent claims 15, 29, 31, 41, and 51 recite similar limitations not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Hwang. Applicant asserts claims 1, 15, 29, 31, 41, and 51 and claims 2-8, 10, 12-14 and 16-22, 24, 26-28 and 30 and 32-33, 36-38, 40 and 42-43, 46-48, 50 and 52-54 dependent from 1, 15, 29, 31, 41, and 51, respectively, are allowable for at least the above reasons.

In addition, Hwang does not disclose, teach, or suggest "human interface logic comprised on the printed circuit board which is operable to receive one or more human interface signals and encode the one or more human interface signals into a format suitable for transmission to a remote location (emphasis added)" as recited in claim 1.

Hwang discloses “Each such monitor and keyboard combination may be spaced from the TEAMPRO chassis by as much. (sic) as 150 feet in the preferred embodiment.” However, Hwang does not provide an enabling description of how the signals can be sent to the monitor and keyboard combination at an extended distance. Hwang also does not disclose encoding the one or more human interface signals as recited in claim 1. Independent claims 15, 29, 31, 41, and 51 recite similar limitations not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Hwang.

Furthermore, Hwang does not disclose, teach, or suggest a “computer card comprises: a frame” and “a power supply comprised on the frame” as recited in claims 29, 31, 41, and 51. Hwang teaches “a unitary power supply to provide electrical power for all of the electronics contained within the TEAMPRO chassis (Hwang, col. 5, lines 57-59).” Hwang does not teach a power supply on the computer card as recited in claims 29, 31, 41, and 51. Applicant asserts claims 29, 31, 41, and 51 and claims 30 and 32-33, 36-38, 40 and 42-43, 46-48, 50 and 52-54 dependent on claims 29, 31, 41, and 51, respectively, are allowable for at least the above reasons.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections

The Office Action has rejected claims 9 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hwang in view of Fleming (U.S. Patent No. 6,073,188) (hereinafter “Fleming”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection. Applicant asserts claim 9 and 23, dependent on claims 1 and 15, respectively, are allowable for at least the above reasons.

The Office Action has rejected claims 11 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hwang in view of Beasley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,884,096) (hereinafter “Beasley”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection. Applicant asserts claim 11 and 25, dependent on claims 1 and 15, respectively, are allowable for at least the above reasons.

The Office Action has rejected claims 34, 39, 44, 49, 35, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hwang in view of Fleming and further in view of Beasley. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection. Applicant asserts claims 34, 35, 39 and 44, 45, 49, dependent on claims 31 and 41, respectively, are allowable for at least the above reasons.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5602-09300/JCH.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- ☒ Return Receipt Postcard
- ☐ Request for Approval of Drawing Changes
- ☐ Notice of Change of Address
- ☐ Check in the amount of \$ for fees ().
- ☐ Other:

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey C. Hood
Reg. No. 35,198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: 10/17/2013